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Abstract
This chapter traces the history of the scholarly work of faculty with special attention given to my work on the Carnegie Report Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate and the advances that have been made (and not) since its publication in 1990. Topics considered include the scholarship of engagement, tensions between the collegial culture and the managerial culture, and the need to develop a change strategy that is transformative and not just a continuation of the incremental approach. How we build on the scholarly strengths of our pasts, symbolically represented by Athens and Berlin, while organizing in new ways for a diverse, growing, transnational world represented in the challenges of LA is at the heart of this analysis.
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In searching for an image that would best catch the future role of faculty in a changing, vibrant democracy, I—following the lead of Ralph Waldo Emerson—have often referred to “the new American scholar.” (1996) That vision now has lost its resonance; the image has been seriously tarnished in the new global environment and become restricting. In probing for an alternative I have turned to Los Angeles, not because LA is an American city, but because it is an international—a transnational—city. LA is, as the University of Southern California boasts on its Web page, a “global city, the city of the future of the planet.” One visit and you are struck by the rich, pulsating diversity—a stimulating cultural mosaic. But LA is also the template for unplanned, sprawling, privatized growth; it is denigrated as the city with the largest number of backyard swimming pools and the smallest...
number of public parks. A city on the verge of gridlock, the City of
Angels is the place to encounter examples of the world's best music,
art, and architecture. LA represents the kind of dramatic change and
promise the academy of the future will be called upon to address
and serve.

In examining the role of faculty in the new academy, I want
to underscore the significance of the changes taking place. Faculty,
particularly, are prone to dismiss the changes they see coming as
cyclical—“we've seen that before”—and minimize their impact. I then
want to address our approach to change. The additive or incremental
approach to reform will no longer suffice; a more transformative way
of thinking about faculty work is required. It is important to build
on the strengths of our past—symbolized here by references to the
contributions of Athens and Berlin—while simultaneously exploring
new ways to organize faculty work for the future—symbolized by LA.

APPROACHES TO CHANGE

Following World War II, and particularly during the expansionist years
of the 1960s, the major changes made in higher education in the United
States were genuinely transformative. The California Master Plan under
the leadership of Clark Kerr is one example of such comprehensive,
holistic change. The explosive growth in community colleges across
the country is another.

In my own experience, I went directly from graduate work at
Harvard in 1964 to participate in the founding of Raymond College,
an experimental college at the University of the Pacific. Those were
exciting, heady times. Cluster colleges, as they were called, were erected
from the ground up. They were living–learning communities in the
fullest sense. Raymond College was intentionally patterned after Oxford
and Cambridge: students graduated in three years; a complete liberal
arts curriculum was required (one-third humanities, one-third social
sciences, one-third math and natural sciences); there were no majors;
and narrative evaluations were used instead of letter grades.

While approaching change in a transformative way, the experi-
mental colleges of the 1960s were, by and large, counterrevolutionary.
They came into being in opposition to the dominance of the large
research-oriented universities. What they were opposed to was the
rise of an academic hegemony dominated by an increasingly profes-
sionalized, research-oriented, discipline-driven, specialized faculty. The
counter-vision was a more intimate, democratic, student-oriented